



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

The queen's two bodies

Citation for published version:

Murray, C 2020, 'The queen's two bodies: Monumental sculpture at the funeral of Anna of Denmark, 1619', *Sculpture Journal*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 27-44. <https://doi.org/10.3828/sj.2020.29.1.3>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.3828/sj.2020.29.1.3](https://doi.org/10.3828/sj.2020.29.1.3)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Sculpture Journal

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the accepted version of the following article: The Sculpture Journal, which has been published in final form at : <https://online-liverpooluniversitypress-co-uk.ezproxy.is.ed.ac.uk/doi/full/10.3828/sj.2020.29.1.3>

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



***The Queen's Two Bodies:
Monumental Sculpture at the Funeral of Anna of Denmark, 1619***

The magnificent interment in 1619 of Anna of Denmark, queen of James VI and I, was the first public funeral of a reigning English consort in over 80 years.¹ Its splendour and scale reflected Anna's status as the fertile stem from which England's new royal Stuart dynasty would grow. Costing an estimated £30,000, and with over two thousand mourners in attendance, the ritual and material focal points of her elaborate obsequies were her two bodies – her mortal remains, coffined and draped with purple velvet and, resting above, her recumbent wooden effigy.² Together, Anna's bodies were escorted by the sprawling funeral cortege from Denmark House along The Strand to their resting place at Westminster Abbey. Travelling in an imposing horse-drawn chariot and surrounded by black-clad courtiers bearing heraldic banners, this final journey publicly inscribed her human form and its representation with diverse meanings. The processional route formed a liminal space, a symbolically-charged gateway, with the train's slow advance towards its destination reflecting the queen's shifting status. These significances were extended by the great catafalque set up in the north-east area of Henry VII's chapel. Standing by the vault where Anna's body had been deposited, the black monumental structure, embellished with escutcheons, pennons and supporters, supplied a striking stage for the robed effigy. Left *in situ* for the next two months, the hearse confirmed and reinforced the funeral's more fleeting messages. The treatment of Anna's bodies, therefore, from her lying-in-state through her funeral procession to the post-interment display of her effigy and hearse, re-presented the queen. Her sculpted figure functioned as a dynamic ritual object. A visual substitute for her encoffined body, it served as an icon of continuity amidst a performative process of transformation.

According to the theory of the king's two bodies, a monarch had both a natural body, which was personal, physical and mortal, and a political body, which was public, abstract and undying.³ Focusing on medieval English and French royal funerals, Ernst Kantorowicz asserted that these two bodies could be 'visibly segregated' upon the demise of a ruler, with the natural body concealed within its casket and the political body displayed by the effigy.⁴ The ruler's individual loss was juxtaposed with the survival of their undying dignity. This article shifts focus to the early seventeenth century, assessing developments in the ceremonial expression of this political idea. It argues that, through the altering ritual, spatial and material

contexts of Anna's funeral, both her natural and political bodies were imprinted with co-existing personal and public significances. Her obsequies were a carefully directed performance, promoting her distinguished ancestry, royal motherhood and international connections. Accordingly, corpse and effigy came to incorporate supplementary bodies. Together, they signified her lineal, maternal and transnational identities. Anna's posthumous embodiment of these attributes corresponded to her representation in life but, significantly, also benefitted the surviving Stuarts, King James and Prince Charles. Focusing on the admittedly disordered management of Anna's funeral procession, Jennifer Woodward has asserted that 'power was divorced from ceremony'.⁵ Its potent symbolism, however, corresponded closely to dynastic narratives and clearly proclaimed Stuart authority. In this theatre of death, monumental sculpture was animated by the surrounding props and performers. Nevertheless, with the rites concluded, the sculptural remnants became gradually disassociated from their original significances. Unlike the majority of early modern figurative sculpture - busts, statues and tomb monuments - funeral effigies were portable and ephemeral, subject to quickly shifting contexts and audiences. Consequently, they might absorb layers of meaning in succession and relinquish them just as swiftly. Anna's funeral sculpture demonstrates the potential mutability and instability of monumental messages. As meaningful connections were lost, their impressions upon these images faded.

Separating the Queen's Two Bodies

Anna died of dropsy at Hampton Court on 2 March 1619. One week later a small flotilla of twelve barges, draped in black cloth, and 'divers other Boates' escorted her corpse to Denmark House for the lying-in-state.⁶ The location had been carefully prepared in the preceding days. The guard chamber, presence chamber and privy chamber were all hung from floor to ceiling with more black cloth.⁷ Canopies of state had been erected in the presence and privy chambers, adorned with taffeta escutcheons of the queen's arms, topped with an imperial crown.⁸ The bedchamber where the queen's remains were to rest was dressed with black velvet.⁹ In this room, a massive frame resembling a bed had been constructed; nine feet long by nine feet tall by seven feet wide. Set with more escutcheons, its four pillars bore a black velvet valance, trimmed with black silk fringe and garnished with plumes of black feathers. Within this structure, two trestle tables held up the coffin, which was, in turn, draped with a large pall of fine holland and black velvet.¹⁰ Anna's body reposed within its sombre mausoleum for over nine weeks before at last it began its passage to

Westminster on 13 May. It was only then that the queen's natural and political bodies were physically separated and her corpse was united with its representation.

The effigy was made by Maximilian Colt, the king's carver, who was paid £16 for his labour, including: 'for making the Representac[i]on, ffor Iron worke for the ioyns ffor a paire of Bodyes a paire of draweing hose and for bombast to fill them'.¹¹ The result of Colt's efforts was a remarkable polychromatic mixed media sculpture (Figs. 1 and 2). Its head and upper torso were finely modelled in wood, the face rendered with a direct approach. John de Critz, sergeant painter, provided the finishing touches by colouring its features.¹² Even in death, efforts were made to enliven Anna's figure. Comparison with contemporary portraits of the queen, in particular, those by de Critz, himself (Fig. 3), reveal the verisimilitude of the sculpture. The effigy's mimetic qualities were extended in the construction of its frame. Wooden arms were suspended by iron loops from the shoulders, while, rather ingeniously, structure and shape were lent to the effigy by use of undergarments. A pair of bodies or stays formed the lower torso, while a pair of stuffed drawers served for the queen's thighs.¹³ Wooden legs and feet were attached to the drawers.¹⁴ Remarkably, both the straight bodies and drawers of Elizabeth I's funeral effigy survive. Janet Arnold has proposed that it is unlikely that they were ever worn by the queen but were made specifically for the effigy.¹⁵ Their proportions, however, which correspond to a slight delicate frame, suggest that they were made to the queen's measurements. If then this practice was followed for Anna's effigy, with the stays and drawers modelled on her dimensions, the representation's form meticulously simulated her physicality – it was a literal embodiment of the queen. Meanwhile a certain Peter Bland was paid to mend a purple velvet robe, to perfume its ermine surcoat and to trim a crimson gown with both ermine and miniver.¹⁶ Similar items of clothing are recorded in a 1608 inventory of Anna's wardrobe.¹⁷ Dressing the effigy in the queen's own garments again connected her flesh to its wooden copy, moulding the figure to her form and layering it with the marks of her status. With its ceremonial robes and long flowing hair, the effigy referenced the moment upon which her majesty was conferred – the coronation. Crowned and holding a sceptre, it was laid out on top of the coffin, with its head resting upon a crimson velvet cushion, embellished with gold fringe and tassels.¹⁸ As a manifestation of the queen's immortal dignity, Anna's representation was resplendent. More than that though, the proximity between corpse and sculpture generated a charged connection between the hidden and the visible, investing the effigy with a powerful charisma. It was a mystified projection of the now lifeless flesh and bones concealed below. Constructed of wood, fabric

and stuffing, nothing about the figure suggests that it was made to last. It was an ephemeral form but one endowed with potent dualities, signifying the absent and present, sacred and secular, public and private. The queen's remains and her effigy were now bodies in motion, travelling in unison on a symbolic journey.

The Funeral Procession

In a letter to his patron, Sir Dudley Carleton, Nathaniel Brent remarked ruefully that the performance of Anna's funeral procession, had exceeded that of her son, Prince Henry, but fell far short of that of Queen Elizabeth.¹⁹ Writing to the same correspondent, John Chamberlain branded the dawdling train 'a poor shew'; great in number but lacking in decorum and inadequately marshalled.²⁰ Indeed, Brent reserved his praise for one solitary aspect: 'The only remarkable thing was the excellent equipage of the 6 horses and the chariot, with which the statue of her Ma(jes)tie was drawn'.²¹ The specially-commissioned funeral chariot, which displayed corpse and figure, was pulled by six horses in black velvet caparisons with dark plumes upon their heads, while ten knights bore a fringed canopy above.²² Enclosed in its sepulchral conveyance and accompanied by mourners uniformly clothed in trailing black cloaks, the effigy must have seemed radiant against the gloom. Colour and pageantry were also imparted by the banners and bannerols which punctuated the procession. Leading this heraldic patchwork, the great embroidered banner (fig. 4) was held aloft by Philip Herbert, then Earl of Montgomery and William Murray, Earl of Tullibardine.²³ Displaying Anna's armorial bearings, the royal coat of Arms of England, Scotland and Ireland, impaled with the royal coat of arms of Denmark, like her effigy, this large square flag signified the queen's official self. Its status was reflected in its construction, crafted from coloured velvets, cloth of gold and silver, silk and lace, and embellished with gold fringing, pearls and spangles.²⁴ In his discussion of portraiture and heraldry, Hans Belting observed that both likeness and coat of arms shared a 'body reference'.²⁵ Although the former focused on the corporeal and the latter on the trans-corporeal, each served to attest to one and the same person.²⁶ Similarly, the coffin, the recumbent figure and the great banner were involved in a symbiotic relationship. They were a triad of corresponding forms in symbolic connection – all signifiers of Anna. Significantly, of course, the great banner depicted the queen's marital arms – those of her husband, James VI of Scots and I of England and Ireland, united with those of her father, Frederick II, King of Denmark and Norway. As such, King James, who was, in accordance with custom, absent from the funeral proceedings was, in a sense, still

present. His heraldic body was clearly displayed. The great banner, therefore, asserted Anna's spousal body, imprinting on corpse and effigy her standing as wife and queen.

Further heraldic meaning was imparted by the twelve bannerols of descent which enclosed the hearse (fig. 2). Starting with Anna's arms, the bannerols chronicled the queen's illustrious ancestry through both paternal and maternal lines. They included the arms of her parents, Frederick II of Denmark and Sophie of Mecklenburg-Güstrow, her paternal grandparents, Christian III of Denmark and Dorothea of Saxe-Lauenburg, and her paternal and maternal great-grandparents, Frederick I of Denmark and Sophie of Pomerania.²⁷ In fact, the banners charted Anna's heritage back seven generations to her great, great, great, great, great grandparents, John II, Count of Oldenburg, and his wife, Hedwig of Diepholz.²⁸ The profusion of heraldry at Anna's funeral is noteworthy. While banners and bannerols had accompanied the effigies of other English consorts, their imagery was religious as well as heraldic. At the funeral of Henry VII's queen, Elizabeth of York, in 1502, her hearse had been escorted by four knights, each carrying a white banner of the Virgin to denote her death in childbirth.²⁹ When Jane Seymour, third wife of Henry VIII, died in 1537, her representation was also displayed with four banners, depicting scenes from the life of the Virgin.³⁰ With the Reformation this imagery was suppressed and new heraldic narratives were constructed around the effigy.

Anna's distinguished lineage, her own royal blood, had been promoted from the outset of her nuptials to the King of Scots. For her entry into Edinburgh in 1590, a palace-structure had been erected by the Church of St Giles, adorned with the queen's ancestry and the arms of Denmark, as well as the freedoms and arms of all past Scottish queens.³¹ Certainly, dynastic descent was a preoccupation for her husband. Both before and after his accession to the English throne in 1603, King James had argued for the principle of indefeasible hereditary right and had rigorously promoted his own illustrious pedigree as justification of his prerogative.³² Yet Anna's own eminent origins had been advertized too, as Claes Jansz Visscher's engraving (Fig. 5) demonstrates. Here, king and queen are shown, dressed in their coronation robes, placed like statues within niches on either side of a genealogical table of the Stuart line. The recess in which James stands is topped with the royal arms of England, Scotland and Ireland, while Anna's bears the royal arms of Denmark. Beneath the new king, Latin text details his ties to the house of Tudor through his great-grandmother, Margaret Tudor, queen to James IV of Scots. The tablet below Anna, in turn, proclaims her: 'second

daughter of Frederick II King of Denmark and Norway and of Sophia only daughter of Ulric Duke of Mecklenburg, [and] sister to the most serene Christian [IV], ruler of those kingdoms'. The queen's royal heritage added lustre to the Stuart succession. Visscher's print makes clear that the new royal family had impressive international family networks, as well as enduring English connections. The bannerols of descent at the funeral also articulated the antiquity and superiority of Anna's blood. They represented the collective body of her family line. Surrounded by a material genealogy, her remains and their representation were presented as the culmination of this lineage.

In addition to the heraldic symbolism, those who led and followed the chariot also imparted meaning. Closely behind the coffin, Aletheia Talbot, Countess of Arundel, served as chief mourner, having successfully edged out her rival to the position, Margaret Stewart, Countess of Nottingham.³³ As the highest ranking peeress in England, Talbot's distinction reflected that of Anna. Her precedence, however, prompted the senior ladies of the queen's court to wrangle over rank and place. Dorothy Devereaux, Countess of Northumberland, and Jane Ogle, dowager Countess of Shrewsbury, both refused to act as Talbot's supporters and were, at last, replaced by Elizabeth de Vere, Countess of Derby, and Bridget Morison, Countess of Sussex.³⁴ Aside from the final substitutions, the formation of the cortege was remarkable for one other striking irregularity. Walking ahead of the chariot and closely behind the great banner was the queen's son, Prince Charles.³⁵ In so doing, Charles was breaching custom, which restricted mourners to those of the same sex as the deceased.³⁶ In fact, he was no stranger to the royal funeral, having acted as chief mourner at his elder brother's in 1612.³⁷ Moreover, he would flout convention six years later, when at the funeral of his father, King James I, he again served as chief mourner.³⁸ The unusual presence of the nineteen-year-old prince contributed new significance to the procession and to the queen's two bodies. Following the great banner, a heraldic representation of his parents' marriage, Charles' attendance evidenced that this union had borne fruit. This was a public performance of Stuart succession, an affirmation of Anna's maternal body directed onto the effigy.

The funeral's ceremonial representation of family has affinities with Simon van de Passe's silver medallion of 1616 (fig. 6), where the figural and heraldic again come together to offer a reassuring message of dynastic continuity. The obverse shows an intimate family grouping, with a young Prince Charles in the foreground, flanked by his mother and father. Mirroring this composition, on the reverse, the heraldic badge of the Prince of Wales is bordered by the

royal couples' overlapping escutcheons – James' shield supported by the crowned lion of England and Anna's lozenge by the wild man of Denmark. The English crest, with flamboyant mantling, crowns the arrangement, while each supporter rests a foot on a corresponding banderol, one bearing the king's Latin motto, 'Blessed are the peacemakers' and another the queen's Italian motto, 'My greatness is from on high'. Both sides, therefore, articulate a shared narrative, each presenting a literal or symbolic representation of royal Stuart descent. These themes were also adopted in the elegies and epitaphs which marked Anna's death, positioning her at the centre of royal family ties. In William Slatyer's mournful volume, *Threnodia*, for example, she was dubbed:

A vertuous Queene of Albion, of
Noblest race both for sire and sonne.³⁹

Patrick Hannay's collection of commemorative poems esteemed her as:

A Wife, a Daughter, Sister to a King,
Mother to those whose hopes doe higher spring.⁴⁰

At Anna's funeral, the heraldic banners and the participation of Prince Charles also conveyed messages of lineage and succession. Together, they offered a material demonstration of the queen's genealogy balanced with a performative celebration of her role as the source of a Stuart posterity. Interconnected dynastic and domestic meanings were projected onto the deceased and her wooden figure. Both family histories and futures converged on the queen's bodies.

Thus the processional route, from the queen's London residence to her place of interment, constituted a narrative path. The dramatic transferral of Anna's bodies reflected her symbolic passage towards a different state, while the funeral's display materialized her memory.

The Great Hearse

With the arrival of corpse and effigy at Westminster Abbey the ritual focus shifted to the offering ceremony. The queen's remains were separated from her representation in preparation for their interment, while the figure was laid out on its arresting new stage, the

great hearse designed by Maximilian Colt (fig. 7). The Abbey hearse was ambitious in design and execution. Most probably a wooden structure, the hearse took the form of a canopied octagonal platform, lined with black velvet and decorated with the queen's royal arms. A column stood at each corner, supporting a towering baldachin, capped with a pyramid. On the square base four additional pillars were topped with small coloured and gilded statues of heraldic supporters; two Danish wild men, the English crowned lion and the Scottish chained unicorn. As suited their rank, the catafalques for queens consort were both impressive in size and complex in construction. Elizabeth of York's was described as: 'curiously wrought with imagery, & adorned with Banners and Bannerols, Pencils and a Cloth of Estate or majesty & valances of which was fringed accordingly, Inscribed with her word[s], Humble and Reverence, & garnished with her arms, and other her badges'.⁴¹ John Chamberlain, not known for hyperbole, described Anna's catafalque as 'the fairest and stateliest that I thinke was ever seen there'.⁴²

Colt's design, however, may have had a rival. If the catafalque served as a stage for the wooden effigy then Inigo Jones' probable design for Anna's hearse verges on scenography, liberally appropriating the visual and symbolic languages of the masque. A drawing among the Royal Institute of British Architects' collections (fig. 8) has been proposed as his alternative scheme.⁴³ Jones' innovative programme adapts and embellishes more conventional catafalque structures.⁴⁴ It displays an upright, enthroned effigy raised upon a dais and beneath a baldachin, supported by an ornate architectural framework, adorned with classicized caryatids, corbels and cornices.⁴⁵ There has been some doubt as to the specific function of this project but the presence of an urn on the rear pediment and the repetition of a motif from Jones' earlier design for a monument to Lady Francis [sic] Cotton (fig. 9) - a pair of putti bearing arms - points to a funereal function. Connecting the scheme to Anna also poses problems, although the small winged beast, perched beside the queenly figure, may well be a wyvern, the heraldic supporter of Anna's royal arms during her time as Queen of Scots.⁴⁶ The seated effigy has no English precedent. An etching from 1615 of the lying-in-state of Marguerite de Valois, however, may have served as Jones' inspiration. It shows the queen's effigy sitting upright, supported by large tasselled cushions, with hands clasped in prayer.⁴⁷

If Jones' drawing does, indeed, represent his conception of the great hearse, it seems likely that it was rejected on the grounds both of its iconography and of its practicality. Certainly,

the catafalque's imagery was closely aligned to Anna's masqueing *persona*. Sprouting from the roof of the structure is an emblem which had recurred in the queen's public performances, a small sapling laden with fruit – the golden tree.⁴⁸ In 1605, in the sixth month of her pregnancy, Anna had appeared in *The Masque of Blackness*, as Euphoris, a daughter of Niger.⁴⁹ Emerging from a great illuminated shell, the queen danced with her partner, Aglaia, both bearing fans inscribed with their names and the image of 'A golden Tree laden with fruit [sic]'.⁵⁰ Appropriately, given the queen's condition, D.J. Gordon has connected this device with marital fertility.⁵¹ Similarly, Henry Peacham's *Minerva Britanna* (1612) assigns Anna the emblem of an olive tree, budding with the initials of her children, Elizabeth, Henry and Charles, and in a Latin anagram designates her, 'a tree of princes'.⁵² With their bare breasts and clusters of fruit, the hearse's caryatids, conventionally associated with sovereignty, contribute to this theme of abundance and fecundity. Just visible on one of the friezes decorating the base, is an image of a reclining woman, surrounded by urns, ewers and amphorae – possibly a river deity.⁵³ This motif may reference Anna's appearance as the eponymous protagonist of Samuel Daniel's masque, *Tethys' Festival* (1610). In another celebration of 'Anna Progenitrix', the queen played a sea goddess, the mother of three hundred rivers, and danced alongside her children, Prince Charles and Princess Elizabeth.⁵⁴ Overall then, the hearse's iconography points to a richly layered expression of fertility and fruitfulness. If the message was in line with the funeral's narrative, however, the idiom was not. Jones' scheme, if it had been realized, would have presented a striking counterpoint to the austere heraldic display. It is interesting to note that Jones' later executed design for the funeral hearse of King James is representative of a refined, pared-down classicism, more suitable to its place at the centre of the final funereal spectacle.⁵⁵ Convoluted in imagery and complex in construction, the form of his catafalque for Anna was ill-suited to its ritual function.

The 'symbolic core' of the church death rites was the offering ceremony, a performance focused on two sites, representing the spiritual and the earthly, the altar and the hearse. It was usual for the chief mourner to take centre-stage but, again, Prince Charles broke with custom and assumed some of her duties. After both the Countess of Arundel and the prince had offered at the altar, it was Charles who received the funeral banners.⁵⁶ As well as the great embroidered banner and the bannerols of descent, the prince was presented with the eight banners that had followed the coffin, signifying the queen's international connections. Among them were the banners of Denmark, Sweden and Norway, a banner denoting the royal

Union of England and Scotland, and two other banners bearing the arms of Oldenburg and Delmenhorst and of Schleswig, Holstein, Stormarn and Dithmarschen. The ancient heritage of Anna's origins was acknowledged in two banners representing the Goths and the Vandals.⁵⁷ In life, the queen had promoted her continental networks, playing an important role as 'mediator between the king and foreign powers'.⁵⁸ Following her death, James Maxwell had prefaced his poem, *Carolanna* (1619), with a table detailing her 'kinsfolkes' and her ties to Spain, France, the Holy Roman Empire, Denmark, the German Duchies, Scotland, England and Ireland.⁵⁹ It is interesting then that the funeral banners prioritized the queen's Northern Protestant connections – a significant choice given the growing religious tensions in Europe with the early stages of the Thirty Years War. It is possible that the heraldic programme was also designed to mitigate the queen's reported Catholicism.⁶⁰ As Charles accepted the banners they were placed upon 'formes' around the hearse.⁶¹ By the time this part of the ceremony was over, the catafalque, bearing its effigy, was surrounded on three sides by the twenty-one funeral banners carried at the procession.⁶² In this light, the adoption of a more traditional catafalque structure makes sense. Where Jones' project would have jarred with the coats of arms, Colt's instead served as a foil. Again, Prince Charles' participation contributed messages of inheritance and succession. More than that though, displayed within a rich heraldic panoply, Anna's effigy had now been positioned literally at the centre of a transnational network. Her sculpted body assumed further significance as a site of pan-European contacts and alliances. Political and diplomatic ties, as well as familial bonds, were attached to her figure.

In a matter of hours then, the queen's two bodies had become embedded with multiple meanings. Spousal, lineal, maternal and transnational significances had been projected onto corpse and effigy in a magnificent statement of Stuart power. These messages, however, served the living, as well as the dead. While the form and imagery of Anna's funeral paid dazzling tribute to a consort who had met both her biological and political obligations, the surviving royals also gained from her ritual elevation. King James, in particular, had form in this respect, manipulating the theatre of death for political gain on multiple occasions. Certainly, the heralds' records show that the King played an active part in shaping the funeral. When he was acquainted with news of the queen's death, James ordered that her rites be solemnized 'in such manner in all thinges as was Queen Elizabethes'.⁶³ That the king looked to the funeral of a queen regnant rather than a queen consort as his preferred precedent indicates that, from the outset, Anna's rites were to be special.⁶⁴ Indeed, the funeral's

significance is evidenced by efforts to carefully record its form through heraldic documents and drawings. One week later the funeral commissioners, the court's highest-ranking officers, met with the senior heralds to debate the form of the obsequies.⁶⁵ Having devised a 'plott of the p[ro]cedinge', the commissioners sent to the king for further direction.⁶⁶ The Duke of Lennox delivered 'his Majesties pleasure' a few days later and on Thursday 18 March, the full funeral programme was settled.⁶⁷ Peter Sherlock has persuasively argued that the tombs James commissioned for his predecessor, Elizabeth I, and for his mother, Mary, Queen of Scots, re-wrote dynastic narratives, asserting the new king's legitimacy as the political heir of the former and the dutiful son of the latter.⁶⁸ Similarly, Jennifer Woodward has contended that James directed the obsequies of Henry, Prince of Wales, to mitigate tensions between father and son and to re-inscribe his paternal authority.⁶⁹ Family histories were once again revised with Anna's funeral. The rituals of marital monarchy symbolically attached the queen to the king, rendering the consort part of her husband's public body.⁷⁰ As Kevin Sharpe has observed, occasions which saw the ceremonial appearance of the queen and her children were also celebrations of the king.⁷¹ By glorifying Anna's descent, maternity and networks, the funeral, in turn, proclaimed James' success as a husband. His wife's, at times, problematic influence and divergent concerns were neutralized and his spousal command was asserted.⁷² The queen's two bodies then were also an extension of the king, re-presented to conform to his interests.

Afterlives

With the funeral concluded, Anna's body was interred the same night in a vault beneath one of the north-eastern apsidal chapels of Henry VII's Lady Chapel.⁷³ The location was prestigious – behind the altar and in close proximity to the grand tomb of Henry VII and his queen, Elizabeth of York. Indeed, with the exception of the founders of the Tudor dynasty, those royals who already inhabited the chapel, including three of Anna's children, rested in the relative periphery, in the north and south aisles.⁷⁴ In the next decade, the apsidal chapels would accommodate the remains of only the most high-status departed, namely, Ludovic Stuart, Duke of Richmond and Lennox, cousin to King James, and George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, favourite successively to James I and to his son, Charles I.⁷⁵ Anna's final resting place then reflected her exalted position. Located at the heart of Tudor and Stuart bloodlines, however, she was also kept separate. Distanced from her deceased children, the position of Anna's burial site physically maintained her difference as a foreign queen. The

catafalque remained in place until mid-July. The Dean of Westminster had delayed its dismantling, challenging the right of the heralds to claim it as their perquisite.⁷⁶ Eventually the king, himself, ordered that ‘the said Hearse, twoe Palles of Velvet, Sheet, Cushions, Furniture, and whatsoever apperteyneth to it’ should be divided by the heralds.⁷⁷ Later sources though report that the catafalque remained standing over the queen’s body until the Civil Wars, when the Abbey was cleansed of superstitious objects.⁷⁸ It is possible that the basic wooden structure survived, while the more lucrative velvets, taffetas and satins were stripped. In contrast, despite its flimsy construction, the effigy remained on display. Stored upright in a press, it was gradually divested of its clothes, accessories and original significance.⁷⁹ Exhibited as a curiosity, within decades the representation’s estrangement from its purpose and meaning was such that the author, John Phillips, mused:

And now the Presses open stand,
And ye see them all a row,
But more is never said of these,
Than what is said below ...

The noble Prince, Prince Henry,
King James’s Eldest Son,
King James, Queen Anne, Qu. Elizabeth,
And so this Chapel’s done.⁸⁰

By the early eighteenth century, the effigy had been moved to a wainscot press in Islip’s Chantry and, along with the other princely figures, was dismissed by the antiquarian, John Dart, as ‘so mangled, I know not what to make of them’.⁸¹ Anna’s representation then had become invested with new meanings and a different sort of spectacle as a shabby oddity, a bemusing vestige of an outmoded ritual practice.

Thus, with the eventual parting of the queen’s two bodies, the powerful connection between them was broken. Having served its function as a visual mediator of change, the effigy’s mystical aura was lost. Anna’s funeral staged a political process. Its ritual form served to heal a rift in the social order by drawing on languages of continuity. Signalling back to the queen’s ancestry and forward to her posterity, past and future met in her wooden figure, while international connections were woven around it. Above all, the obsequies celebrated

the pre-eminence of the new royal line through the body of its consort – the dynasty’s distinguished heritage, its stable and secure succession and its European networks. No permanent memorial was erected to Anna; her grave was not marked until the nineteenth century. The queen’s funeral, therefore, constituted a final grand gesture of memory making; fashioning and fixing her representation. With the performance over and the journey ended, however, Anna’s bodies became progressively distanced from those messages. The ephemerality of the funeral display meant that meaning was only temporarily inscribed. With the dismantling of the catafalque, the effigy was de-animated. With the disintegration of the effigy, its significances were disembodied. In common with the other royal effigies, once removed from ritual contexts, monumental memories proved short-lived and the carefully constructed identities of the queen’s two bodies were slowly eroded.

¹ The last heraldic funeral for the queen of a living monarch had been that of Jane Seymour, consort to Henry VIII, in 1537.

² J. Woodward, *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England, 1570-1625*, Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 1997, p. 170; London, British Library, Amerigo Salvetti to Andrea Cioli, 23 May, 1619 (nineteenth-century transcription), Add MS 27962, fol. 191r.

³ E. H. Kantorowicz, *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2016, p. ix.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 423.

⁵ Woodward, as at note 2, p. 170.

⁶ London, College of Arms, Funerals of Kings, Princes &c., MS I.4, fols. 6r-6v.

⁷ *Ibid.*, fol. 5r.

⁸ *Ibid.*, fol. 5v; London, The National Archives, The President of the Funerall of O(u)r Late Sovereigne Lady Queene Anne, LC2/5, fol. 7r.

⁹ Document, as at note 6, fol. 5r.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, fols. 5r-5v; Document as at note 8, fol. 3r, fols. 6v-7r.

¹¹ Document, as at note 8, fol. 3r.

¹² *Ibid.*, fol. 13r.

¹³ The stuffed drawers are still visible in Thomas J. Wright’s photograph of the effigy taken in 1906 – see W.H. St. John Hope, ‘On the Funeral Effigies of the Kings and Queens of England, with special reference to those in the Abbey Church of Westminster’, *Archaeologia*, 60, 1906, Pl. LXIV.

¹⁴ The wooden bust survives and is currently on display in Westminster Abbey’s Jubilee Galleries. The figure was in poor condition but largely intact in 1907, when W. H. St. John Hope provided a detailed account of its construction – see *Ibid.*, pp. 555-557. The effigy, however, suffered severe water damage after the Abbey was hit by incendiary bombs during the Second World War – see R. Mortimer, ‘The History of the Collection’ in A. Harvey and R. Mortimer (eds.), *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 1994, p. 28.

¹⁵ J. Arnold, ‘The “pair of straight bodies” and “a pair of drawers” dating from 1603 which Clothe the Effigy of Queen Elizabeth I in Westminster Abbey’, *Costume*, 41, 2007, p. 1.

¹⁶ Document, as at note 8, fol. 3v.

¹⁷ J. Field, ‘The Wardrobe Goods of Anna of Denmark, Queen Consort of Scotland and England (1574-1619)’, *Costume*, 51, 1, 2017, see the supplementary transcription of Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, Anna of Denmark’s Wardrobe Inventory, MS Dd.I.26, p.17, <https://www.euppublishing.com/doi/suppl/10.3366/cost.2017.0003>. Under the heading ‘Coronation Roabes’, the inventory lists ‘One roabe of purple velvet, Lyned with powdered Ermines & taffeta with purple Stringes and Buttons’, as well as a crimson velvet kirtle and pair of bodies.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, fol. 9r. Should be document as at note 8

¹⁹ London, The National Archives, Nathaniel Brent to Dudley Carleton, 15 May, 1619, SP14/109, fol. 77r.

- ²⁰ N.E. McClure (ed.), *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, Philadelphia, The American Philosophical Society, 1939, Vol II, p. 237.
- ²¹ Document, as at note 18, fol. 77r. Should be note 19.
- ²² Document, as at note 6 fol. 13r; Document, as at note 8, fol. 3v, fol. 5r.
- ²³ J. Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities of James the First*, London, JB Nichols, 1828, Vol. 3, p. 539; Document, as at note 6, fol. 12v. Philip Herbert would become Earl of Pembroke on the death of elder his brother in 1630.
- ²⁴ Document, as at note 8, fol. 6r; fol. 16v.
- ²⁵ H. Belting (Thomas Dunlop trans.), *An Anthropology of Images*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2011, p. 69.
- ²⁶ Ibid., p. 67.
- ²⁷ Document, as at note 6, fol. 13r.
- ²⁸ Ibid., f.13r; London, College of Arms, MS W.B., fol. 103v.
- ²⁹ London, College of Arms, Briscoe MS II, p. 310.
- ³⁰ M. Hayward, *Dress at the Court King Henry VIII*, Abingdon and New York, Routledge, 2007, p. 65.
- ³¹ D. Stevenson, *Scotland's Last Royal Wedding: The Marriage of James VI and Anne of Denmark*, Edinburgh, John Donald Publishers, 1997, p. 114.
- ³² C. Murray, *Imaging Stuart Family Politics: Dynastic Crisis and Continuity*, London and New York, Routledge, 2016, p. 4; E. Murphy, *Familial Forms: Politics and Genealogy in Seventeenth-Century English Literature*, Newark, University of Delaware Press, 2011, p. 51.
- ³³ McClure as at note 19, Vol. II, p. 232. Should be note 20.
- ³⁴ Ibid., Vol. II, 232; Document, as at note 6, fol. 13r.
- ³⁵ Nichols, as at note 22, Vol. 3, 539; Document, as at note 6, fol. 13r. Should be note 23.
- ³⁶ Woodward, as at note 2, p. 168.
- ³⁷ Ibid., p. 153; G. Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1981, p. 87.
- ³⁸ Murray, as at note 29, p. 86. Should be note 32.
- ³⁹ W. Slatyer, *Threnodia*, London, John Beale, 1619, Sig. B3v.
- ⁴⁰ P. Hannay, *Two Elegies, On the Late Death of our Sovereigne Queene Anne with Epitaphes*, London, Nicholas Okes, 1619, Sig. D4r.
- ⁴¹ Document, as at note 29, p. 311. Interestingly, Anna's hearse was embellished with her husband's motto.
- ⁴² McClure as at note 19, Vol. II, p. 237. Should be note 20.
- ⁴³ J. Harris, S. Orgel and R. Strong, *The King's Arcadia: Inigo Jones and the Stuart Court*, London, Arts Council of England, 1973, p. 99.
- ⁴⁴ See, for example, pen and ink illustrations for the catafalques of a gentleman, lord, baron, earl and duke in London, British Library, Volume Containing Various Papers relating to Heraldry and Ceremonials, Add MS 14417, fols. 7r-9r.
- ⁴⁵ A possible precedent for this design is Bernardo Buontalenti's *Catafalque for Cosimo I, Grand Duke of Tuscany*, 1574, which has a similar raised platform supported by four caryatids. A drawing of the catafalque survives in Florence at the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, MS Nuovi Acquisti n.1025, c.15.
- ⁴⁶ For an example of Anna's Scottish royal arms, see Anon., *Anna, Queen of Scots*, c.1596, engraving, 24.7 x 16cm, Museum No. 1864,0813.8, British Museum, London.
- ⁴⁷ See Jan Ziarnko, *The Funeral Bed of the Queen Marguerite*, 1615, etching, 25.1 x 33.1cm, Museum No. Y,1.60, British Museum, London.
- ⁴⁸ C. McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court*, Manchester and New York, Manchester University Press, 2002, p. 206.
- ⁴⁹ K. L. Middaugh, 'The Golden Tree': *The Court Masques of Anna of Denmark*, unpub. PhD Thesis, Case Western Reserve University, May 1994, p. 119.
- ⁵⁰ B. Jonson, *The Characters of Two Royall Masques: The One of Blacknesse, The Other of Beautie*, London, Thomas Thorp, 1608, Sig. B4r. The golden tree also features in Samuel Daniel's masque, *Tethys' Festival* (1610) and Thomas Campion's masque for the Earl of Somerset's marriage (1614).
- ⁵¹ D.J. Gordon, 'The Imagery of Ben Johnson's The Masque of Blacknesse and the Masque of Beautie', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 6, 1943, p. 127.
- ⁵² H. Peacham, *Minerva Britanna*, London, W. Dight, 1612, p. 13.
- ⁵³ A later example of this type of imagery can be found on the triumphal arch, erected at the Royal Exchange for the Coronation of Charles II, which shows the River Isis as a reclining female personification holding a ewer – see David Loggan, *Triumphal Arch at the Royal Exchange, Cornhill*, 1662, engraving, 42.7 x 28.9cm, Museum No. E.570-1890, Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
- ⁵⁴ L. Barroll, *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England: A Cultural Biography*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001, p. 123.

- ⁵⁵ See Inigo Jones, *Design for the Catafalque of James VI and I*, 1625, pen and ink with wash and graphite, 31.8 x 43.8cm, Worcester College, Oxford.
- ⁵⁶ Nichols, as at note 22, p. 542; London, College of Arms, Funerall Ceremony, MS R.20, fol. 491v.
- ⁵⁷ London, The National Archives, List of the Banners and Bannerolls to be Carried in the Funeral Procession of the Queen, SP14/109, fol. 36v. Should be note 23
- ⁵⁸ A. Whitelock, 'Reconsidering the Political Role of Anna of Denmark', H. Matheson-Pollock, J. Paul and C. Fletcher (eds.), *Queenship and Counsel in Early Modern Europe*, London and New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, p. 245.
- ⁵⁹ J. Maxwell, *Carolanna, That is to Say, A Poeme in Honour of Our King, Charles James, Queene Anne, and Prince Charles*, London, Edward Allde, 1619, Sigs. A2r – A4r.
- ⁶⁰ The nature of the queen's faith is still a source of scholarly debate. For discussions concerning Anna's confessional identity see, A. J. Loomie, 'King James I's Catholic Consort', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 34, 1971; M. Meikle and H. Payne, 'From Lutheranism to Catholicism: The Faith of Anna of Denmark (1574-1619)', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 64, 1, 2013; Barroll, as at note 49; and S. Dunn-Hensley, *Anna of Denmark and Henrietta Maria: Virgins, Witches and Catholic Queens*, London and New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017. Add J Field
- ⁶¹ Nichols, as at note 22, p. 542; Document, as at note 27, fol. 104r. See also Document, as at note 51, fols. 491v-492r. Should be note 28, note 56.
- ⁶² Nichols, as at note 22, p. 542.
- ⁶³ Document, as at note 6, fol. 5r.
- ⁶⁴ Detailed precedents for the funerals of Jane Seymour and Elizabeth of York were available and might have been considered more appropriate.
- ⁶⁵ Document, as at note 6, fol. 7r. The five principal commissioners were Edward Somerset, Earl of Worcester, as Lord Privy Seal; William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, as Lord Chamberlain; Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, as Earl Marshal; Robert Sidney, Earl of Leicester, as the queen's Lord Chamberlain; and George Carew, Lord Carew, as the queen's Vice-Chamberlain.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid., fol. 7r.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid., fol. 7v.
- ⁶⁸ P. Sherlock, 'The Monuments of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart: King James and the Manipulation of Memory', *Journal of British Studies*, 46, 2, April 2007, p. 278.
- ⁶⁹ Woodward, as at note 2, p. 162.
- ⁷⁰ S. Fiorato, 'Anna of Denmark and the Performance of the Queen Consort's Sovereignty', S. Fiorato and J. Drakakis (eds.), *Performing the Renaissance Body: Essays on Drama, Law and Representation*, Berlin and Boston, De Gruyter, 2016, p. 248.
- ⁷¹ K. Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2010, p. 100.
- ⁷² While the extent of Anna's opposition to James' policy has tended to be exaggerated, there were both tensions and clashes between husband and wife. For a nuanced account of the queen's influence and agency, see Whitelock, as at note 53, pp. 237-258. Should be note 58
- ⁷³ Olivia Bland, *The Royal Way of Death*, London, Constable, 1986, p. 45.
- ⁷⁴ At the time of Anna of Denmark's funeral, the Tudor queens, Mary I and Elizabeth I, as well as Anna's two infant daughters, Mary and Sophia, were all buried in the north aisle. Mary, Queen of Scots, and Anna's elder son, Henry, Prince of Wales, were buried in the south aisle.
- ⁷⁵ Before his assassination in 1628, the Duke of Buckingham's son and nephew were also interred in the family vault. See Sherlock, as at note 63, p. 161.
- ⁷⁶ C. Gittings, *Death, Burial and the Individual in Early Modern England*, London, Croomhelm, 1984, p. 225.
- ⁷⁷ Document, as at note 27, fol. 98r. Should be 28.
- ⁷⁸ A. Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England: From the Norman Conquest*, London, Colburn and Co., 1851, Vol. 5, p. 183; A. P. Stanley, *Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey*, London, John Murray, 1868, p. 183.
- ⁷⁹ It is likely that the effigy's apparel - from robe to stays - was stolen piece by piece. A drawing of the wooden figure dating from 1787 shows it wholly stripped, with exception of the stuffed drawers – see John Carter, *The Royal Funeral Effigies in Henry V's Chantry Chapel, Westminster Abbey, 1787*, watercolour, Westminster Abbey Library, Langley Collection, Box IX.1. In 1616 the communion cloth, two copes and the robes of Prince Henry's effigy were stolen from the Abbey – See M.A. Everett Green (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series): James I, 1611-18*, London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1858, p. 361.
- ⁸⁰ John Phillips, *Sportive Wit*, London, Nathaniel Brook, 1656, p. 100.
- ⁸¹ John Dart, *Westmonasterium or The History and Antiquities of the Abbey Church of St Peters Westminster*, London, James Cole, 1723, Vol. I, p. 192.